CLARK COUNTY CLEAN WATER COMMISSION Meeting Notes

Wednesday, February 6, 2002 6:00 – 9:00 PM Clark County Public Works Department Conference Room 4700 NE 78th Street Vancouver, Washington

Call to Order

Roll Call:

<u>Clark County Clean Water Commission Members Present</u>
Willie Bourlet, Cal Ek, Dana Kemper, Don Steinke, Art Stubbs and Peter Tuck

<u>Clark County Clean Water Commission Members Absent</u> Robbie Agard, Mary Martin, and Susan Rasmussen

<u>Clark County Public Works Staff</u> Kelli Frost, Sam Giese and Earl Rowell

Audience

Dan Clark, Bill Owen, and Virginia van Breeman

Introduction

The members of the Clark County Clean Water Commission, Clark County staff, and guests were introduced. Chair, Commissioner Kemper, then called the meeting to order.

Agenda and material review

The material for tonight's meeting include:

- 1. 2/6/02 Clark County Clean Water Commission meeting Agenda;
- 2. 1/9/02 Clark County Clean Water Commission meeting notes;
- 3. Water Resources Site Inventory Draft
- 4. Clean Water Business Partner Program

1/09/02 notes

The notes from the 1/09/02 Clark County Clean Water Commission meeting were approved as written.

Water Resources Site Inventory

Mr. Rowell referred to handout number three, Draft Water Resources Site Inventory, which lists places that have been monitored in the past as well as the locations that are currently being monitored by Clark County as well as by other groups and agencies.

Mr. Kemper: Are these sites listed on the pin map?

Mr. Rowell: We are developing a map that will identify all these sites.

Future Clean Water Commission Meeting Topics

Mr. Rowell reviewed a list of topics for future Clean Water Commission meetings:

March

- 1) Monitoring
 - a) Lacamas 2001-2002 Project Summary
 - b) Lacamas Habitat/Benethic Survey
- 2) Education
- 3) Budget 2003-04
- 4) CIP Update

April

- 1) Monitoring
 - a) Long-term index sites 2001 Summary
 - b) Long Term Monitoring Quality Assurance Plan
- 2) Budget 2003-04
- 3) Update BOCC
- 4) CIP Update
- 5) Watershed Stewards

May

- 1) Education
- 2) Budget 2003-04

Recognition of people doing good clean water work

Mr. Rowell referred to handout number four, Clean Water Business Partner Program, which is an example of how the Clean Water Commission can, by working together with the Business Community, be able to reduce impacts to surface water bodies.

Mr. Rowell: We will provide this Commission with a list of the various types of groups, people, and individuals along with a specific list of criteria for recognition.

Mr. Bourlet: Will you make sure that it addresses education and information?

Mr. Steinke: I don't want to have winners in any category. Anyone making a positive contribution can be recognized with a certificate of appreciation. This is not a contest.

Mr. Rowell: I have informed our staff that this is not an award program but a recognition program.

Term expiration of Mr. Steinke and Mr. Stubbs

Mr. Rowell asked Mr. Steinke and Mr. Stubbs if they were interested in serving another term as Clean Water Commissioners.

Mr. Stubbs and Mr. Steinke both expressed their desire to serve another term as a Clean Water Commissioner.

Mr. Bourlet proposed Motion 2002-0206-01: Move for the Chair to sign the letter to the Board of County Commissioners to have Mr. Steinke and Mr. Stubbs re-appointed to the Clean Water Commission.

Motion passed by all Commissioners present.

Updates/Communications from the public/media/agencies

Mr. Rowell: I have developed a memorialization of the work session from, January 16th work session with the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) that includes the following information:

- 1. The Clean Water Commission provided an overview of the clean water program, and presented to the BOCC the 2001 Annual Report.
- 2. The Clean Water Commission outlined the accomplishments of 2001 and the goals for 2002.
- 3. The BOCC thanked the Clean Water Commissioners for their hard work. They also requested water quality health base line information of each watershed to be available to citizens including via the Internet.
- 4. The BOCC directed staff to review and edit typographical errors in the report.

Mr. Ek: Is the memorialization available to us?

Mr. Rowell: You should have received a copy by e-mail.

Mr. Ek: I'd like to hear from the Chairman on what the BOCC said at the work session?

Mr. Kemper: They were impressed by what we have accomplished so far. They also had similar concerns about monitoring. There was a push from the BOCC on making sure that we get the testing started ASAP. They were impressed with the money that we have left over in our budget.

Mr. Stubbs: They were pleased at the level of participation from this group.

Mr. Bourlet: Mr. Ek made a valid point. We need to think about how much of the water is clean. We always talk about how much of the water is dirty but we need to also think about how much of the water is clean.

Mr. Rowell: I received a call from a gentleman regarding his property receiving county road runoff as part of a culvert. Years ago the County asked if they could discharge onto his property, and he agreed. Over the years there has been no problem. Now he is receiving a clean water fee bill and he is looking for an incentive on his bill in exchange for the runoff onto his property.

Mr. Ek: We need to keep in mind that we are unanimous in believing that this fee is not based on property, though this gentleman has a valid point and we should have some consideration for this issue.

Public Input

Mr. Owen: I've seen information regarding monitoring, budget and CIP projects and one thing I haven't seen yet, from the meetings I have attended, was information on education. What type of feedback do you hope to get from an education program? What do you hope to get back from the public?

Mr. Stubbs: The Education Sub-Committee is working on this issue. We are hoping to do a geographic survey of individuals to find out what kind of chemicals they use, how much they buy each year, then go back after a year of performing education programs and survey the same individuals to see if we have done changed awareness. We are also hoping to get feedback from the Watershed Stewards program.

Mr. Ek: Do you have any ideas Mr. Owen?

Mr. Owen: It's hard for me to comment directly, as I haven't been in the county for very long.

Mr. Ek: There have been some educational opportunities at the Clark County Fair, the Home and Garden Show, and others. We are still looking for the best avenue to address the education effort.

Mr. Owen: I recommend looking to see what kinds of grants are available to offset the incentive programs.

Mr. Kemper: We are always looking at different grant opportunities. The majority of the grants out there are for testing and monitoring programs.

Mr. Kemper: What brought you to our meeting tonight Mr. Clark?

Mr. Clark: I work for the City of Portland as Public Works Superintendent where I run the Waste Water Treatment Plant. I have been following this program for some time. My opinion is that your money would be well spent in the schools educating children because they then take the message home to parents and they start to take an interest.

Mr. Stubbs: I agree with you. Though it is hard to determine how quantifiable education programs are.

Capital Subcommittee Update

Mr. Giese: The Subcommittee is currently working on the selection criteria or ranking criteria for the projects. Based on comments from the first meeting, I have developed the following handout. (Exhibit A)

Mr. Giese: At the last meeting we discussed on-going programs where we would establish a dollar amount per year. This would include, the small stormwater facility retrofits; assistance programs for helping people disconnecting their roof drains; a program to add water quality on a limited basis to the drywells in town. Also, at Mrs. Rasmussen's request we included money to pay for oversizing other projects that are constructed by the private sector and by other agencies where there's additional benefit to be gained above and beyond the mitigation that they have to do for their project.

Mr. Giese: The capital planning is going ahead on three different levels.

- 1. Fast track or pilot program, where we will identify in the next month, several projects to commence in the summer of 2002. As well as initiating activity on some on going programs.
- 2. We will continue to solicit projects. We will be ranking projects, finalizing estimated costs for the higher ranking projects and developing a list of projects to accomplish over the next one three years.
- 3. We are working on basin plans, which is a requirement of the NPDES permit.

Mr. Giese: Our intent is to maintain progress at all three levels. At the next CIP Subcommittee meeting we will go over detailed information on the fast track projects.

Mr. Bourlet: Were there any outfalls identified in the lawsuit?

Mr. Rowell: There were 125 –130 outfalls identified as part of the lawsuit.

Mr. Bourlet: Were any of those tested?

Mr. Rowell: In your materials from December there was a report that talks about outfall testing and some of those are likely to be the same outfalls that are part of the lawsuit.

Mr. Bourlet: What does Department of Ecology say about clean water staying clean.

Mr. Giese: I have heard that the Department of Ecology's preference would be to work in those areas that are beginning to develop but are not built out.

10/03/03 4

Mr. Kemper: As far as trying to figure out your selection criteria are you going to use the same kind of system like transportation?

Mr. Giese: That is something we discussed and haven't resolved completely. My intent is to do a matrix.

Mr. Bourlet: I would like the record to show that we as a Commission and Clark County are asking the public for any projects that they think we ought to address in cleaning up streams, creeks, rivers, whatever in any neighborhood.

Mr. Giese: In regards to Suds creek project that Mr. McConathy brought up at a previous Clean Water Commission meeting, it is something we should look at.

Mr. Ek: I'd like to be assured that these relate to our mission, which is the cleaning up of county induced water quality issues. We are here because the County was challenged to clean up its water. We should not include projects that do not relate to cleaning up county water.

Other Topics

Mr. Bourlet: My neighbors have asked me to make a statement of their concerns. Government/Bureaucrats do not run businesses real well. People out where I live are concerned about the county building a laboratory and going out and testing the waters in Clark County. Many of us would rather see the county write the criteria, hire a company through contract. We would like to see a cost benefit analysis showing that it is wise for the county to do this.

Mr. Rowell: We will most likely be hiring outside consultants to do some testing, we will also be working closely with other agencies to help us make sure that we have consistent information throughout the various watersheds.

Mr. Kemper: How do we get the annual report out to the citizens in the county?

Mr. Rowell: We will put it on our web page. It can also be part of the clean water fee billing.

Mr. Ek: We should at least make sure that the first six pages are referenced and appended to our minutes on the web page.

Mr. Bourlet: I would like to make a comment on the Watershed Stewards. Kelli does an excellent job of sending out information, and I don't know that I need the guy that is supposed to be running the Watershed Stewards program sending me information that I have already been sent. I would like to see him concentrate on Watershed Stewards.

Mr. Ek proposed Motion 2002-0206-02: Move that this Commission thank Commissioners Tuck, Steinke, and Stubbs for serving their designated terms and we appreciate their participation.

Motion passed by all present Clean Water Commission members.

Adjourn

Mr. Kemper adjourned the Clean Water Commission meeting at 9:00 p.m.

The next Clark County Clean Water Commission meeting will be held Wednesday, March 6, 2002.

Respectfully submitted by Kelli Frost